PS

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/512,378	02/25/2000	Oscar Chi-Lim Au	016660-038	7227

21839 7590 12/15/2005

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL PC
(INCLUDING BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS)
POST OFFICE BOX 1404
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1404

EXAMINER	
THOMPSON, JAMES A	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2624	

DATE MAILED: 12/15/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/512,378	AU ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	James A. Thompson	2624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *19 September 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☒ Claim(s) *1,13-15,17,18 and 20-22* is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *2-9,11,12,16 and 19* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *25 February 2000* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments, see page 10, line 7 to page 11, line 23, filed 19 September 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. While Applicant is correct in the assessment that Murakami (US Patent 5,268,771) teaches that the coefficients used in the convolution processor are predetermined (column 7, lines 50-51 of Murakami), Applicant errs in the statement that the coefficients are independent of the image data itself. The particular set of coefficients that are used for a particular target pixel are selected based upon the pixel value itself, along with the pixel values of the surrounding local neighborhood, since the set of coefficients to be used is selected based upon the local gradient of the target pixel (column 7, lines 51-64 of Murakami). It is not the distance of a neighborhood pixel from the target center pixel alone that determines the coefficient to be used, but said distance in combination with the value of each neighborhood pixel, since the value of each neighborhood pixel determines the gradient of the local neighborhood. Therefore, the rejections of claims 2-4, 16 and 19 under 35 USC §102(b) are maintained.

2. Applicant's arguments, see page 12, line 1 to page 14, line 4, filed 19 September 2005, with respect to the rejections of claims 1, 13-15, 17-18 and 20-22 under 35 USC §103(a) have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejections of claims 1, 13-15, 17-18 and 20-22 under 35 USC §103(a) listed in items 7-9 of the previous office action, dated 08 April 2005 have been withdrawn.

Examiner agrees with Applicant at least in that modifying the filtering process taught by Murakami to be an iterative process - according to the teachings of Wong (US Patent 5,506,699) - would not be an obvious modification to make, but not for every reason set forth in Applicant's present arguments. Firstly, although Murakami does characterize the result of the selection as the final output data, there is no reason why the output data cannot be further processed, such as through an iterative procedure. Secondly, while the iterative repetition of the Murakami method would not necessarily lead to a less desirable result, said iterative repetition would also not necessarily lead to a more desirable result. If the solution based on the Murakami method converges, then the result will be more satisfactory. Over-filtering generally occurs when there is no numerical convergence of a solution. If there is a convergent solution to a numerical computation, then a stable result will occur. However, a stable, converging solution does not necessarily result in the case of iterating the Murakami method. Further, if the numerical solution diverges for an image after the first iteration, then the result of two iterations will be worse than with only one. There is no way to control or anticipate whether a particular image will produce a convergent or divergent solution through an iterative version of the Murakami method.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 2-4, 16 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Murakami (US Patent 5,268,771).

Regarding claims 2, 16 and 19: Murakami discloses defining a set of neighborhood pixels (figure 5 of Murakami) of the individual pixel (figure 5(A) and column 7, lines 34-37 of Murakami), the set of neighborhood pixels including the individual pixel and additionally a plurality of pixels (figure 5(B-F) of Murakami) proximate said individual pixel (column 7, lines 25-30 of Murakami); deriving for each pixel of the neighborhood (column 7, lines 39-42 and lines 48-51 of Murakami), a significance coefficient (figures 7A-7C and column 7, lines 54-61 of Murakami) that is based upon the value of that pixel (column 7, lines 51-64 of Murakami); and deriving the reconstructed value of the individual pixel (column 8, lines 35-41 of Murakami) as a sum over the pixel of the neighborhood of a product of the halftone image value at that neighborhood pixel with the significance coefficient of that neighborhood pixel (column 8; lines 3-5, lines 19-22 and lines 31-34 of Murakami). Significance coefficients (figures 7A-7C and column 7, lines 54-61 of Murakami) are determined based on each neighborhood pixel's distance from the target pixel (column 7, lines 25-30 of Murakami) and the overall neighborhood gradient (column 7, lines 57-61 of Murakami).

Further regarding claim 16: The "first value" recited in claim 16 corresponds to the "halftone image value" recited in claim 2. Further, the "first image" recited in claim 16 corresponds to the "halftone image" recited in claim 2.

Therefore, the limitations of claim 16 are fully embodied within the limitations recited in claim 2.

Further regarding claim 19: In order to process digital image data on a digital image data processor (figure 1(800) of Murakami), some form of computer program product which is readable by a computing device (figure 1(800) of Murakami) is inherent.

Regarding claim 3: Murakami discloses that said halftone image is derived from an original image having a continuous value for each pixel (column 8, lines 35-41 of Murakami), and, for each individual pixel (figure 5(A-F) and column 7, lines 31-37 of Murakami), said significance coefficient of each neighborhood pixel is an indication of the likelihood that the value of that neighborhood pixel in the original image is correlated with the value of the individual pixel in the original image (column 7, lines 54-61 and column 9, lines 33-39 of Murakami). The use of the term "restoration" (column 8, lines 35-41 of Murakami) implies that the image data was originally continuous value image data for each pixel. This is further evidenced by the fact that, in the background of Murakami, it is explained that restoring the original continuous value image data is the purpose of the method taught by Murakami (column 1, lines 16-21 of Murakami). The distance of the pixels from the target pixel (column 7, lines 31-37 of Murakami) combined with the gradient of the overall neighborhood (column 7, lines 54-61 of Murakami) provides a significance coefficient for each neighborhood pixel. The higher the gradient of the neighborhood determines how fast the values of the neighborhood pixels change, and thus how different the surrounding pixels are from the target pixel. Said gradient, coupled with the distance

from the target pixel of each individual pixel, provides a significance coefficient for each neighborhood pixel that is therefore a measure for each neighborhood pixel of the likelihood that the value of each neighborhood pixel is correlated with the value of the individual (target) pixel in the original image. Further, a greater number of coefficient matrices are possible in the system taught by Murakami, based on other varying conditions (column 9, lines 33-39 of Murakami).

Regarding claim 4: Murakami discloses that, for each individual pixel, said step of deriving a significance coefficient for each neighborhood pixel includes deriving a baseline value for the individual pixel, and deriving said significance coefficient as a function of the halftone value for the image at that neighborhood pixel and of the baseline value for the individual pixel (column 7, lines 55-61 of Murakami). The significance coefficient for each of the individual neighborhood pixels is a function of the gradient of the neighborhood of pixels (column 7, lines 55-61 of Murakami). This inherently requires a baseline value since the gradient is determined based on the absolute value of the difference in the image values over the area of the neighborhood. The baseline value is the value upon which these differences are based. The absolute value of the halftone value of the individual minus the baseline value determines the gradient of the image in the direction of said individual pixel.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 5-8 and 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murakami (US Patent 5,268,771) in view of Wong (US Patent 5,506,699).

Regarding claim 5: Murakami does not disclose expressly that the baseline value for the individual pixel is derived by low pass filtering of the halftone image.

Wong discloses deriving a baseline value for the individual pixels by low pass filtering the halftone image (figure 2(18) and column 5, lines 6-9 and lines 13-17 of Wong).

Murakami and Wong are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely the conversion of halftone data into restored grayscale data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use a low pass filter to obtain the baseline value, as taught by Wong. The motivation for doing so would have been to avoid overly blurring the resultant image (column 5, lines 16-19 of Wong). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Wong with Murakami to obtain the invention as specified in claim 5.

Regarding claim 6: Murakami discloses that, for each individual pixel, the significance coefficient for each neighborhood pixel is a decreasing function $f(v)$ of the absolute difference (v) between the halftone value at that neighborhood pixel and the baseline value for the individual pixel (figures 7A-7C and column 7, lines 55-61 of Murakami).

As disused above in the arguments regarding claim 4, the gradient is determined based on the absolute value of the difference in the image values over the area of the neighborhood. The baseline value is the value upon which these differences are based. The absolute value of the halftone value of the individual minus the baseline value determines the gradient of the image in the direction of said individual pixel. The significance coefficient for a particular pixel decreases as the gradient, or absolute difference, increases, as demonstrated in figures 7A-7C of Murakami. Figure 7A of Murakami is an example of when the gradient is most abrupt (column 7, lines 58-60 of Murakami). The farthest pixel will therefore have the largest absolute differences in halftone values between themselves and the target pixel. However, the farthest pixels also have the lowest significance coefficient values (figure 7A("1") of Murakami). In the cases of lessening gradients, and thus lower absolute differences (column 7, lines 58-61 of Murakami), the same pixels have higher significance coefficients (figure 7B("2" in same positions as "1" in figure 7A) and figure 7C("4" in same positions as "1" in figure 7A) of Murakami). Therefore, $f(v)$ is a decreasing function of the absolute difference (v) between the halftone value at that neighborhood pixel and the baseline value for the individual pixel.

Regarding claims 7 and 8: As discussed above in the arguments regarding claims 5 and 6, Murakami in view of Wong teaches that the significance coefficient is a function $f(v)$ which is a decreasing function of the absolute difference (v) between the halftone value at a neighborhood pixel and the baseline value for the individual pixel, wherein said baseline value for said individual pixel is derived by low pass filtering

of the halftone image. Therefore, given a low-pass filtered value for the baseline value and the relationship of a low-pass filtered value with the value itself, $f(v)$ is both a non-linear and a continuous function.

Regarding claim 11: Murakami does not disclose expressly forming an enhanced reconstructed image as a linear combination of said reconstructed image and a continuous image derived from said halftone image by a second image reconstruction method.

Wong discloses forming an enhanced reconstructed image as a linear combination of said reconstructed image (figure 3(24) of Wong) and a continuous image derived from said halftone image by a second image reconstruction method (figure 3(26) of Wong) (column 6, lines 35-37 of Wong).

Murakami and Wong are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely the conversion of halftone data into restored grayscale data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use a final low pass filter in linear combination with the reconstructed image, as taught by Wong. The motivation for doing so would have been to remove unwanted high frequency components that may be generated at the final stage of continuous-tone image reconstruction (column 6, lines 35-37 of Wong). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Wong with Murakami to obtain the invention as specified in claim 11.

Further regarding claim 12: Wong discloses that said second image reconstruction method is a low pass filter (figure 3(26) and column 6, lines 35-37 of Wong).

7. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murakami (US Patent 5,268,771) in view of Wong (US Patent 5,506,699) and obvious engineering design choice.

Regarding claim 9: Murakami in view of Wong does not disclose expressly that $f(v)$ is a function of the form $f(v)=a(1-v/b)^k$. However, Murakami does disclose that a plurality of coefficient matrices can be stored and selected from based according to various conditions (column 9, lines 33-39 of Murakami). Therefore, specifically selecting the equation $f(v)=a(1-v/b)^k$ to design the coefficient matrices to use in the system taught by Murakami in view of Wong is an obvious engineering design choice. At a certain level, a specific formula for designing the matrices must be selected in order for there to be a practical construction of the system taught by Murakami in view of Wong. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would be motivated to specifically use the equation $f(v)=a(1-v/b)^k$ for very specific image restoration conditions and/or problems.

Allowable Subject Matter

8. Claims 1, 13-15, 17-18 and 20-22 are allowed.

The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance: As discussed above in item 2, Examiner has agreed that claims 1, 13-15, 17-18 and 20-22 are not obvious in light of Murakami and Wong. Furthermore, Examiner has not discovered any additional prior art references that would anticipate claims 1, 13-15, 17-18 and/or 20-22 or render claims 1, 13-15, 17-18 and/or 20-22 obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time of the invention. Therefore, claims 1, 13-15, 17-18 and 20-22 are allowed.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Conclusion

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James A. Thompson whose telephone number is 571-272-7441. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30AM-5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David K. Moore can be reached on 571-272-7437. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

James A. Thompson
Examiner
Art Unit 2624

JAT
25 November 2005

THOMAS D. LEE
PRIMARY EXAMINER